

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are presently active in this case. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 are amended, Claims 16 and 17 are added, and Claims 2, 3, and 5 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kimura (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,126). Claims 4, 6, 8, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kimura in view of Lee (European Patent No. 1 104 181 A1). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kimura in view of Robb (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,950). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kimura.

Applicants and Applicants' representative wish to thank Examiner Tran and Primary Examiner Ho for the interview granted on October 5, 2004. During that interview, the outstanding rejections were discussed in detail. Further, during the interview amended claims along the lines presented herewith were discussed and arguments as hereinafter discussed were presented. During the interview Examiners indicated that such amended claims appeared to distinguish over the current rejections, and that they would update their search in view of the amended claims when such amended claims are formally presented in a filed response.

Claims 2, 3, and 5 are canceled, rendering the rejection of these Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) moot.

In regard to the rejection of Claims 1, 9, 10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, recites an image pick-up apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, light region separating means provided between a first and a second light regions, the light region separating means being molded integrally with a lens mount as a single element.

As agreed during the interview, Kimura does not disclose at least the above-mentioned light region separating means of Claim 1, as amended. The outstanding Office Action cites Fig. 5 of Kimura to teach the claimed “light region separating means”; however, the above-mentioned light region separating means of Claim 1, as amended, is not disclosed in Kimura. Nowhere does Kimura disclose or suggest at least light region separating means provided between a first and a second light regions, the light region separating means being molded integrally with a lens mount as a single element, as recited in Claim 1, as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn. Claims 9, 10, and 13 depend on Claim 1. For at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 9, 10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn as well.

In regard to the rejection of Claims 4, 6, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kimura in view of Lee, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 4, 6, 8, and 14 depend on Claim 1. As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Kimura does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in Claim 1. For example, Kimura does not teach or suggest at least light region separating means provided between a first and a second light regions, the light region separating means being molded integrally with a lens mount as a single element, as recited in Claim 1, as amended. Lee does not cure the deficiencies of Kimura in this regard.

In view of the failure of Kimura and Lee to teach or suggest all features of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Kimura in view of Lee does not render Claim 1 obvious

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Since Claims 4, 6, 8, and 14 depend on Claim 1, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 4, 6, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In regard to the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kimura in view of Robb, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 15 depend on Claim 1. As discussed above with respect to Claims 1, Kimura does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in Claim 1. For example, Kimura does not teach or suggest at least light region separating means provided between a first and a second light regions, the light region separating means being molded integrally with a lens mount as a single element, as recited in Claim 1, as amended. Robb does not cure the deficiencies of Kimura in this regard.

In view of the failure of Kimura and Robb to teach or suggest all features of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Kimura in view of Robb does not render Claim 1 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Since Claim 15 depends on Claim 1, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In regard to the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kimura, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 7 depend on Claim 1. As discussed above with respect to Claims 1, Kimura does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kimura does not render Claim 1 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Since Claim 7 depends on Claim 1, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

New Claim 16 recites an image pick-up apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a first image forming lens for forming as an image on said light-receiving surface a first light entering from

a first direction toward said light-receiving surface, said first image forming lens forming an image on a first light region of said light-receiving surface, a second image forming lens for forming as an image on said light-receiving surface a second light entering from a second direction different from said first direction toward said light-receiving surface, said second image forming lens forming an image on a second light region of said light-receiving surface, wherein said first and second image forming lenses are disposed such that said first and second light regions are located diagonally relative to each other on said light-receiving surface.

As agreed during the interview, Kimura does not teach or suggest a first and a second image forming lenses disposed such that a first light region and a second light region are located diagonally relative to each other on a light-receiving surface, as recited in Claim 7, as amended. Claim 16 includes recitations similar to those in Claim 7 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 16 defines patentable subject matter. New Claim 17 depends on Claim 16.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that each and every one of Claims 1-17 defines patentable subject matter, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and timely allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
CP:ajf

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423